

## REMARKS

The following is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed on December 4, 2003. Claims 26-28 and 31-33 were examined. The Examiner rejected claims 26-28 and 31-33 under 25 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Stam.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 26 as being anticipated by the aperiodic texture mapping algorithm described on pages 1-9 of a paper authored by Jos Stam, "Aperiodic Texture mapping," ERCIM, July 1996-March 1997. In response, Applicant is amending claim 26 and, as the rejection might be applied to the amended claim, respectfully traverses.

Claim 26 as amended recites the limitations of (i) identifying an aperiodic tile set, and (ii) generating textured tiles by mapping the aperiodic tile set onto a textured image area. Stam does not teach identifying an aperiodic tile set and mapping a tile from that set onto a textured image area to obtain texture data for a texture tile. Rather, Stam teaches generating a texture tile by applying a noise function to color data to compute texture data. Nowhere does Stam disclose a mapping step to obtain texture data for the texture tile. Stam therefore fails to teach each and every one of the recited steps of amended claim 26, and this failure precludes Stam from anticipating amended claim 26. For these reasons, Applicant submits that amended claim 26 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of claim 26.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 27 and 28 as being anticipated by Stam. Amended claim 27 and previously presented claim 28 depend from

allowable amended claim 26 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 26. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of claims 27 and 28 and allowance of those claims

In addition to the foregoing, Applicant is amending dependent claim 27 to more particularly and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant submits that this amendment is fully supported by the specification (see, e.g., Fig. 4). Further, the amendment is not being made to distinguish a reference. Amended claim 27 is therefore entitled to a full range of equivalents.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claim 31 as being anticipated by Stam. In response, Applicant is amending claim 31 and, as the rejection might be applied to the amended claim, respectfully traverses.

Similarly to amended claim 26, amended claim 31 recites the limitations of (i) identifying an aperiodic tile set, and (ii) generating textured tiles by mapping the aperiodic tile set onto a textured image area. As explained with respect to claim 26, Stam does not teach identifying an aperiodic tile set and mapping a tile from that set onto a textured image area to obtain texture data for a texture tile and thus fails to teach all of the recited steps recited in, and does not anticipate, amended claim 31. For these reasons, Applicant submits that amended claim 31 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of claim 31.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 32 and 33 as being anticipated by Stam. Amended claim 32 and previously presented claim 33 depend from allowable amended claim 31 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 31. Applicant therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection of claims 32 and 33 and allowance of those claims.

In addition to the foregoing, Applicant is amending dependent claim 32 to more particularly and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant submits that this amendment is fully supported by the specification (see, e.g., Fig. 4). Further, the amendment is not being made to distinguish a reference. Amended claim 32 is therefore entitled to a full range of equivalents.

#### Claims 36-39

New claims 36 and 37 depend from allowable amended claim 26 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 26. Further, claims 36 and 37 are supported by the specification (see, e.g., Fig. 4 and page 16, respectively). Similarly, new claims 38 and 39 depend from allowable amended claim 31 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 31. Further, claims 38 and 39 are supported by the specification (see, e.g., Fig. 4 and page 16, respectively). For these reasons, Applicant requests allowance of claims 36-39.

Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, Applicant believes that he has overcome all of the rejections set forth in the Office Action mailed December 4, 2003 and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, please contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephanie Winner  
Registration No. 52,371  
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500  
Houston, Texas 77056-6582  
Telephone: (650) 330-2310  
Facsimile: (650) 330-2314